## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 2, 13-16, 18, 19-24, 28, and 30-31 will have been amended and are submitted for reconsideration by the Examiner. Claims 25-27 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

Initially, Applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and for the confirmation of the receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents, in the Official Action.

Applicants further note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filed in the present application on December 17, 2003 by the return of the initialed and signed PTO-1449 Form, and for consideration of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has objected to the specification with respect to the title. By the present amendment, Applicants have amended the title of the application to be more descriptive. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amended title and withdraw the objection.

The Examiner has rejected claim 28 under U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection and submit that it is inappropriate.

Rather, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 clearly and distinctly points out the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In particular, Applicants note that claim 28 refers to two multifunction apparatuses. Claim 28 is directed to a multifunction apparatus that does not have a facsimile transmission function. Additionally, the controller of claim 28 is recited as being configured to send, to the server, based on the information regarding the menu, scanned image data together with predetermined information indicating "another multifunction apparatus". It the "another" multifunction apparatus which has a facsimile transmission function, not the first recited multifunction apparatus which is defined by claim 28.

Moreover, this aspect of Applicants' invention is set forth with additional clarity in the last paragraph of claim 28 which recites that the server transmits, to the "another" multifunction apparatus, the image data scanned by the multifunction apparatus based on the predetermined information. In other words, claim 28 refers to a multifunction apparatus which does not have a facsimile transmission function and "another" multifunction apparatus which has a facsimile transmission function. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claim 28 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Nevertheless, by the present amendment, Applicants have amended claim 28 to clarify the scope of the invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, and 30-31 under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by PARRY (US 2003/0030664). The Examiner has rejected claim 20 under U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by KITADA (US

2006/0190622). The Examiner has rejected claims 14, 21, 24, and 25 under U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over PARRY in view of KITADA. The Examiner has rejected claims 2-6, 17, 26-27, 28-29, and 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over PARRY in view of IDAHARA (US 2002/0032736). The Examiner has rejected claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over PARRY in view of FETHEROLF (US 2003/0043404).

As noted above, Applicants have amended and resubmitted claims 1, 13-15, 18, 19-24, 28, and 30-31 for consideration and have canceled claims 25-27 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections based on the pending claims and will discuss the rejection with respect to the pending claims in the present application, as will be set forth hereinbelow. The claims have been amended merely to clarify the subject matter, but not to narrow the scope of the claims.

Applicants' claims 1-14 and 28-29 relate to a multifunction apparatus having at least a copying function. The multifunction apparatus is connected to a discrete server via a network, the discrete server storing information regarding a menu. The menu is displayable on the multifunction apparatus. The multifunction apparatus has a panel that displays the menu, the menu representing functions of the multifunction apparatus. The multifunction apparatus has a controller that communicates with the discrete server, receives the information regarding the menu from the discrete server, and displays, on the panel, the menu representing the functions of the multifunction apparatus, based on the information regarding the menu received from the discrete server (utilizing the terminology of claim 1 as a non-limiting example). Claims 15-24 recite related servers, claim 30 recites a related system, and claims 32-35 recite related methods.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 22-23 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), PARRY relates to a workstation 520 connected to a printing device 50 (Fig. 1). The workstation 20 has a display monitor 30 that presents a display output of an application program as a "window" (see paragraph [0033]). A client application software of workstation 20 includes a graphical user interface software application used to locate and display Web pages, commonly called a Web browser 21 (see paragraph [0034]). On the other hand, the printing device 50 has a Web server 54. The Web server 54 generates at least one web page that provides an interface for printing device 50 (see paragraph [0042]). A Web browser 21 of the workstation 20 requests the Web server 54 of printing device 50 to send a displayable web page 56 to the Web browser 21, which includes customized or customizable printer control panels (see paragraph [0050]). Thus, in PARRY, the multifunction apparatus (printer 50) includes a copying function and an embedded server.

However, PARRY does not disclose a multifunction apparatus (with at least a copying function) that is connected to a discrete server that stores information regarding a menu, the menu being displayable on the multifunction apparatus. Rather, PARRY merely discloses the printing device 50 that is connected to the workstation 20. In the workstation 20, the Web browser 21 merely requests to the Web server 54 embedded in the printing device 50 to send a displayable web page 56 to the Web browser 21 (see paragraph [0050]). Thus, PARRY does not contain any disclosure regarding a discrete server that stores information regarding a menu, the menu being displayable on the multifunction apparatus that has at least a copying function.

PARRY also does not disclose a multifunction apparatus that has a panel that displays the menu, the menu representing functions of the multifunction apparatus (as defined). Rather, PARRY merely discloses a printing device 50 that does not have a panel that displays a menu,

the menu representing functions of the printing device 50 (Fig.1). Thus, PARRY does not contain any disclosure regarding the printing device 50 that has a panel that displays a menu, the menu representing functions of the printing device 50.

Further, PARRY does not disclose a multifunction apparatus that has a controller that communicates with the discrete server, receives the information regarding the menu from the discrete server, and displays, on the panel, the menu representing the functions of the multifunction apparatus, based on the information regarding the menu received from the discrete server. Rather, PARRY merely discloses a printing device 50 that has embedded therein the Web server 54 that sends a displayable web page 56 to the Web browser 21 of the workstation 20. Thus, PARRY does not contain any disclosure regarding a printing device 50 that has a controller that communicates with the discrete server, receives the information regarding the menu from the discrete server, and displays, on the panel, the menu representing the functions of the multifunction apparatus, based on the information regarding the menu received from the discrete server.

On the other hand, the pending claims recite a multifunction apparatus that is connected to a discrete server via a network, the discrete server storing information regarding a menu, the menu being displayed on the multifunction apparatus. The pending claims also recite a panel that displays the menu, the menu representing functions of the multifunction apparatus. The pending claims further recite a controller that communicates with the discrete server, receives the information regarding the menu from the server, and displays on the panel, the menu representing the functions of the multifunction apparatus, based on the information regarding the menu received from the discrete server.

Thus, the pending claims are clearly patentable over PARRY.